

**REMARKS**

**I. Formalities**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for foreign priority and receipt of the certified copy of the priority document.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for initialing and returning form PTO 1449 submitted with the Information Disclosure Statement filed on February 8, 2001.

**II. Status of the Application**

Claims 1-32 have been Examined. Claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29 and 31 have been rejected. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 30 and 32 have been objected to. With this amendment, Applicant adds claims 33-47 to more fully cover various implementations of the application.

**III. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, 24, 26, 28, 29 and 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCann et al. (US 6,516,089) ["McCann"] in view of Kim (US 5,615,310) ["Kim"]. For at least the following reasons, Applicant traverses the rejection.

McCann discloses a method of performing color-matching so that an original image and an output image have equal color reproduction characteristics even if the original image and the output image have different color reproduction ranges. However, McCann fails to teach or even remotely suggest that an image-processing parameter is obtained according to the resolution of an image. Since color-matching is not dependent on the resolution of an image, the color-

matching will not lead to an idea of obtaining the image-processing parameter according to the resolution.

In addition, claim 1 recites an image-processing method comprising the step of “reconstructing an image which has a resolution differing from a reference-resolution, based on an image signal subjected to a multiple-resolution transformation process.” Based on the cited sections in McCann, the Examiner contends that BESTOUT image 160 corresponds to the claimed reconstructed image, and that the original image 130 corresponds to the claimed reference-resolution.

McCann discloses a method of “mapping” a color gamut of an image to match a color gamut of a device in “a visually pleasing way” (col. 1, lines 59-63). To accomplish this, calculation are done pixel by pixel to match the color gamut of an original mage in Media A to that of a reproduced image in Media B (col. 2, lines 9-19). This allows for an original image to look like another image with completely different colorimetric values by calculating new values for all the pixels in the original image (col. 2, lines 60-62).

Applicant submits that McCann does not disclose or even remotely suggest that the reference-resolution is different from the reconstructed image as set forth in the claimed combination. In fact, one skilled in the art would reasonably interpret McCann as teaching that the resolution is the same in both the images since new values are calculated pixel by pixel.

Further, if the requirements of claim 1 are applied to the Examiner’s contentions, then an image-processing parameter which is used for performing predetermined image-processing on the BESTOUT image 160 must be calculated based on a reference-processing parameter which

is used for performing a predetermined image-processing on the original image 130. Further, the predetermined image-processing must be performed on the BESTOUT image 160 by using the image-processing parameter.

The Examiner does not indicate which parts of the McCann reference correspond to the claimed image-processing parameter and the predetermined image-processing of the present invention. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner indicate which parts of the McCann reference allegedly correspond to the claimed image-processing parameter and the claimed predetermined image-processing of the present invention.

However, Applicant submits that, although the Examiner contends that the process of generating the BESTOUT image 160 of McCann corresponds to the predetermined processing of the present invention, it is clear that the elements recited in Claim 1 of the present invention do not correspond to the elements disclosed in McCann.

Further, the Examiner concedes that McCann does not disclose reconstructing an image based on an image signal subjected to a multiple-resolution transformation process. To cure this deficiency, the Examiner applies Kim.

Kim discloses a method of converting the resolution levels of images so as to have them adapted to the resolution levels of the printers when images are printed at printers having various resolution levels. However, Kim fails to teach or even remotely suggest that the parameter of image processing is obtained as in the case of the present invention.

In addition, none of the cited references discloses an image signal on which multi-resolution conversion processing has been performed. Kim discloses a method of converting the

resolution according to the resolution of the printer. However, the processing is not the multi-resolution conversion processing as in the case of the present invention.

Further, Kim discloses a circuit for matching resolutions of data transmitted from a host computer and an image forming device (Abstract). To accomplish this, Kim discloses a video controller 100 that stores video data sent from a computer at one rate and outputs the data to engine part 200 at another rate to match the resolution of the printer (see col. 4, lines 8-17). The Examiner contends that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings of Kim and McCann to provide a step of matching resolutions before printing so that data having a different resolution than the primary may be printed as an original size.

Applicant submits that one skilled in the art would readily recognize that, as set forth in claim 1, a reconstructed image is created from an image signal (one illustrative, non-limiting example is an image signal based on an acquired digital image). The image signal is one that has been subject to a multiple-resolution transformation. To the extent Kim may disclose a transformation as contended by the Examiner, it is for the printed image and is thus only for a single image and single resolution conversion. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Kim that an image signal based on the computer image, which forms the basis for the printed image, is subjected to a multiple-resolution transformation as set forth by the claimed combination.

Because claims 15 and 24 recite similar features as claim 1, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable for at least the reasons given above in claim 1.

Because claims 3, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 17, 20, 22, 26, 28, 29 and 31 depend on one of the independent claims 1, 15 and 24, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies.

In addition, the Examiner has allowed the subject matter in claim 32 which is similar to the subject matter recited in rejected claims 10, 12, 14, 20, 22, 29 and 31; therefore, Applicant submits that these claims are patentable for at least this additional reason.

Claims 6 and 8 recite that a "reference-processing parameter is stored in correlation with said image signal." The Examiner cites a section of McCann that relates to the reproduction image 160 as disclosing the claimed features.

Specifically, the section discloses in col. 4, lines 12-15 that the "image reproduction of resulting Reproduction [BESTOUT] image 160 can be achieved by any of the wide variety of image reproduction units including (a) units for storage, display, printing, or the like."

Applicant requests that the Examiner clarify his position since the cited section does not appear to disclose the claimed combination.

The Examiner did not state the grounds for the rejection of claim 28. Applicant requests that the Examiner state the grounds of rejection for this claim.

#### **IV. Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for finding allowable subject matter in claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 30 and 32.

Applicant holds rewriting these claims in abeyance until the subject matter regarding their base claims is resolved.

**V. Conclusion**

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.


Respectfully submitted,

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

  
Bhaskar Kakarla  
Registration No. 54,627

Date: June 18, 2004